

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/770,538	01/26/2001	Zheng J. Geng	80169-0026 (GNX-026)	6786
20480 73	590 11/28/2003		EXAMINER	
STEVEN L. NICHOLS RADER, FISHMAN & GRAVER PLLC 10653 S. RIVER FRONT PARKWAY SUITE 150 SOUTH JORDAN, UT 84095			NGUYEN, JENNIFER T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				PAPER NUMBER
			2674	(
5001117011271111, 01 04075		•	DATE MAILED: 11/28/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	Office Action Summan	09/770,538	GENG, ZHENG J.			
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Jennifer T Nguyen	2674			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
THE - External after - If the - If NC - Failurian Any I	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION maions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period reto reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by staturely received by the Office later than three months after the mailing adparent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir ply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te. cause the application to become ABANDONE	mely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication.			
1)[🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26.	January 2001.				
2a)□	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3)□	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	 4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) 7-9 and 15-17 is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1,4-6,10,13,14,18,22 and 25-27 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 2,3,11,12,19-21,23 and 24 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 					
Application Papers						
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examin The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corrections.	cepted or b) objected to by the defended or b) objected to by the defended or by the drawing(s) is objection is required if the drawing(s) is objection is required if the drawing(s) is objection is required.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
12) \(\tag{ a} \) \(\tag{ 5} \) \(\tag{ 5} \) \(\tag{ 5} \) \(\tag{ 5} \) \(\tag{ 6} \) \(\tag{ 7} \) \(\tag{ 6} \) \(\tag{ 7} \) \(Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreignal All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents. Certified copies of the priority documents. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents. Certified copies of the priority d	nts have been received. Ints have been received in Applicational applicational applicational applicational application has been received tic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1190 (1190 provisional application has been received tic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 120 priority under 35 U.S.C. § 120	con No ed in this National Stage ed. e) (to a provisional application) r in an Application Data Sheet. eived. and/or 121 since a specific			
Attachment(s)						
2) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal P	(PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 09/770,538

Art Unit: 2674

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is responsive to amendment filed on 09/08/2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 3. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tsao (U.S. Patent No. 6,302,542).

Regarding claim 18, referring to Figs. 1, 5d, 5e, and 11, Tsao teaches a method of providing a volumetric three-dimensional display device, comprising the steps of: rotating a helical display screen that sweeps out a cylindrical three-dimensional display space (Figs. 5d and 5e); projecting two-dimensional slices (14a) of a three-dimensional data set on said rotating helical screen so as to generate a three-dimensional volumetric display on said screen; selectively projecting a two-dimensional image that is superimposed on said three-dimensional volumetric display, wherein said selective projection of said two-dimensional image is synchronized with rotation of said rotating helical display screen (see abstract, from col. 3, line 19 to col. 4, line 40, and col. 5, lines 1-44).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Application/Control Number: 09/770,538

Art Unit: 2674

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 4, 10, 22, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson (U.S. Patent No. 5,162,787) in view of Shaffer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,050,690).

Regarding claims 1, 10, and 22, referring to Figs. 11-15 and 17, Thompson teaches a volumetric three-dimensional display device (900) with an interactive pointer (635), the device comprising: a rotating helical display screen (900) that sweeps out a cylindrical three-dimensional display space; a projector (10) for projecting two-dimensional slices of a three dimensional data set on said rotating helical display screen (900) so as to generate a three dimensional volumetric display on said rotating helical display screen (100); and a laser pointer (635) generating a laser beam (from col. 17, line 57 to col. 20, line 12, and col. 23, lines 17-65).

Thompson differs from claims 1, 10, and 22 in that he does not specifically teach the laser beam is pulsed laser beam. However, referring to Figs. 8 and 9, Shaffer teaches laser beam is pulsed laser beam (col. 8, lines 31-57). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the laser beam is pulsed laser beam as taught by Shaffer in the system of Thompson in order to provide a dynamic interaction with the volumetric 3D display.

Regarding claims 4 and 25, Thompson further teaches projector comprises a spatial light modulator (from col. 17, line 57 to col. 20, line 12, and col. 23, lines 17-65).

Page 4

6. Claims 5, 6, 13, 14, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson (U.S. Patent No. 5,162,787) in view of Shaffer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,050,690) and further in view of Kahn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,793,361).

Regarding claims 5, 13, and 26, the combination of Thompson and Shaffer further teaches the laser pointer wireless transmits a signal indicating said pointer's orientation relative to said three-dimensional display space (from col. 17, line 57 to col. 20, line 12).

The combination of Thompson and Shaffer differs from claims 5, 13, and 26 in that it does not specifically teach the laser pointer further comprises an orientation sensor. However, referring to Fig. 3, Kahn teaches a laser pointer comprises an orientation sensor (55) (col. 7, lines 9-67). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the laser pointer further comprises an orientation sensor as taught by Kahn in the system of the combination of Thompson and Shaffer in order to provide sufficiently fast delivery of the sensed data to the display.

Regarding claims 6, 14, and 27, the combination of Thompson, Shaffer, and Kahn further teaches a wireless receiver (72) for receiving said signal indicating said pointer's orientation relative to said three-dimensional display space, wherein said received signal is provided to a central processor (84) of said display device and said three-dimensional volumetric display is modified to indicate that section of said three-dimensional display space at which said pulsed laser beam strikes said rotating helical display screen (from col. 17, line 57 to col. 20, line 12, and col. 23, lines 17-65 of Thompson and col. 7, lines 9-67 of Kahn).

Application/Control Number: 09/770,538 Page 5

Art Unit: 2674

7. Claims 2, 3, 11, 12, 19-21, 23, and 24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected

base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

8. Claims 7-9 and 15-17 are allowed.

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure:

Morton (U.S. Patent No. 4,922,336) teaches three dimensional display system.

Soltan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,854,613) teaches laser based 3D volumetric display

system.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Jennifer T. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-3225.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Richard A Hjerpe can be reach at 703-305-4709.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, DC. 20231

Or faxed to: 703-872-9306 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, sixth-floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is 703-306-0377.

Jennifer T. Nguyen 11/21/2003

SUPERVISORY TO A A CONTROL TECHNOLOGY TO THE TECHNOLOGY